Revival Scheme for ReyrolJe Bum Ltd,

395. SHRIMATI CHANDRA KALA PANDEY:
SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE:

Will the Minister of HEAVY INDUSTRIES AND PUBLIC ENTERPRISES be pleased to state:

(a) whether a revival scheme for Reyrolle Bum Limited was sanctioned by BIFRon 15th October. 2000 with a cut off date of 1st April, 1997;

(b) whether on representation of Government, sanctioned scheme had to be modified in May 1998;

(c) whether the modified scheme does not spell as and who and by whom the cash loss could be financed;

(d) whether no working capital was extended by UBI to the scheme; and

(e) if so, the action taken by Government and if not, the actual reasons for the failure of the scheme?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEAVY INDUSTRIES AND PUBLIC ENTERPRISES (DR. VALLABHBHAIKATHIRIA): (a)to (e) BIFR had sanctioned a revival scheme of RBL on 15.10.1997 which was subsequently modified in May, J 998. BIFR reviewed the implementation of the revival scheme of RBL in a hearing held on 111 0.2000 and declared the scheme as failed after taking into consideration all the factors including non-extension of working capital assistance by UBI. It also directed the Opening Agency (OA) *i.e.* I1BI to issue advertisement inviting offers for change in management. Separately, the Government of India had also undertaken an exercise earlier for location of a joint venture partner in respect of RBL without success. A communication to this extent has already been sent to the operating agency *i.e.* I1BI. The future of the company is dependent on the final verdict of BIFR. In the meantime, in order to mitigate the hardship of the existing employees, the management has introduced a voluntary retirement scheme in the company and it is expected that all the 193 employees of the company will avail the same.

Settlement of Industrial Dispute in MUL

396. SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN:
SHRI GAYA SINGH:

Will the Minister of HEAVY INDUSTRIES AND PUBLIC ENTERPRISES be pleased to state:

(a) whether the prolonged industrial dispute in the Maruti Udyog Ltd. (MUL) was finally settled in January this year; and

(b) if so, for how many days the dispute continued and what are the terms and conditions of the settlement arrived at paving the way for resumption of full operation of the jompany?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEAVY INDUSTRIES AND PUBLIC ENTERPRISES (DR. VALLABHBHAI KATHIRIA): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) As per MUL, the agitation continued from I lth September, 2000 to 8th January, 2001. The main terms and conditions of the settlement are as under:

— The workmen shall call-off their agitation and join their duty *w.e.f* 9th January, 2001.

— The Union and workmen accept the Productivity, Performance and Profitability linked incentive scheme notified by company on 1 lth October, 2000.

— The Union on its behalf and on behalf of the workmen would give an undertaking that the workmen would adhere to the norms of discipline and the provisions of the Certified Standing Orders of the company.

— As a special case, the termination of 20 workmen belonging to essential service and 21 trainees would be revoked after these employees express regret for their conduct.

— !n case of 5 workmen, the termination would be converted into suspension and action will be taken in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders of the company.

— In case of 10 other suspended employees, action will be taken in accordance with the Certified Standing Orders of the company.

— Regarding the case of 24 dismissed employees, the law will take its own course.

He-constitution of Hindi Salahakar Samiti

397. DR. Y LAKSHMI PRASAD: Will the Minister of HEAVY INDUSTRIES AND PUBLIC ENTERPRISES be pleased to state:

(a) when was Hindi Salahakar Samiti re-constituted recently in his Ministry;

(b) the number of sittings of the Samiti held during the last three years, year-wise; and